

REMARKS

This application has been reviewed in light of the Office Action dated July 20, 2007. In view of the foregoing amendments and the following remarks, favorable reconsideration and withdrawal of the objections and rejections set forth in the Office Action are respectfully requested.

Claims 1-14 are pending, of which Claims 1, 8 and 9 are independent. Claim 8 has been cancelled. Claims 9-14 have been withdrawn from consideration, as being directed to a non-elected invention. Claim 1 has been amended to further clarify features of the present invention. Claim 9 has been amended along the same lines of Claim 1, in compliance with MPEP 821.04. Support for these changes can be found in the original disclosure. Therefore, no new matter has been added.

Claim 8 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,356,937 (Montville et al.). Claims 1-3 and 5-7 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Montville et al. in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,148,329 (Meyer). Claim 4 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Montville et al. in view of Meyer, and further in view of U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2002/0055909 (Fung et al.). These rejections are respectfully traversed.

Independent Claim 1 now recites that the method for facilitating access to messages includes notifying the intended recipient *using a notification message* of the message stored in the database, *wherein the notification message contains an address of or a link to a website*. Support for this newly-recited feature can be found, *inter alia*, in paragraphs 14 and 15 of the present specification.

The outstanding Office Action acknowledges that the primary citation to Montville et al. is deficient as to a notification feature and relies on the on Meyer to teach a notification feature. The Office Action concluded that “[o]ne skilled would have been motivated to incorporate Meyer’s teachings within Montville’s invention because message alert is a common/popular feature in many email client at the time applicant’s invention was made and it would allow a user to know when new messages are available.” (Office Action, Page 7.) Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection.

Nonetheless, Applicants have further clarified the notification feature recited in independent Claim 1, distinguishing further this feature from that of the cited art. In particular, the notification message, as claimed in independent Claim 1, notifies the intended recipient using a notification message of the message stored in the database, wherein the notification message contains an address of or a link to a website. Applicants submit that the cited art of record fails to teach or suggest, at least, this feature.

The Meyer patent generally teaches a Universal Messaging System providing an integration of voice, data and fax messaging services. According to this patent, a subscriber only needs to check a single notification device for new messages that may arrive on any one of the messaging services. For example, Meyer teaches e-mail message, message waiting indicator light, stutter dial tone pager and/or automatic outdial phone call. However, Meyer is understood to teach a notification message simply indicating that a message has arrived, and is silent as providing any additional information.

The primary reference to Montville is admittedly lacking of a notification feature entirely, and thus cannot compensate for the above-noted deficiencies of Meyer.

Fung et al. has also been reviewed, and is not understood to cure these deficiencies with respect to the other cited references.

Accordingly, Applicants submit that independent Claim 1 is patentable for at least the reasons set forth above. Applicants further submit that dependent Claims 2-7 are also patentable, at least but virtue of their dependencies on an allowable claim, as well as for the additional features they recited. Individual consideration thereof is respectfully requested.

Furthermore, Applicants request rejoinder of withdrawn Claims 9-14 pursuant to MPEP 821.04. Applicants submit that rejoinder is proper as it Claim 9 recites features similar to those recited in Claim 1.

Applicants submit that this Amendment After Final Rejection places the subject application in condition for allowance. This Amendment was not presented earlier, because Applicants believed that the prior Amendment placed the subject application in condition for allowance. Accordingly, entry of the instant Amendment, as an earnest attempt to advance prosecution and reduce the number of issues, is requested under 37 C.F.R. § 1.116.

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the rejections under 35 U.S.C. §§ 102 and 103, favorable reconsideration and early passage to issue of the present application.

Applicants' undersigned attorney may be reached in our Washington, D.C. office by telephone at (202) 530-1010. All correspondence should continue to be directed to our below-listed address.

Respectfully submitted,

/Ann M. McCamey/

Ann M. McCamey
Attorney for Applicants
Registration No. 57,016

FITZPATRICK, CELLA, HARPER & SCINTO
30 Rockefeller Plaza
New York, New York 10112-3801
Facsimile: (212) 218-2200
AMM/klm

FCBS_WS 1694060v1